United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/087;146	03/01/2002	Sandra L. Gray	SP01-033B	4407	
22928	7590 10/10/2003		EXAM	EXAMINER	
CORNING INCORPORATED			KUNEMUND, ROBERT M		
SP-TI-3-1 CORNING, NY 14831			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1765		

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Offic Action Summany	10/087,146	GRAY ET AL.			
Offic Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Robert M Kunemund	1765			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r she t with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> .				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL 2b) ☑ Thi	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-55</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-55</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).					
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.					
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.	5) Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s)			

Application/Control Number: 10/087,146

Art Unit: 1765

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 to 7 and 9 to 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oba (6,238,479).

The Oba reference teaches a method of growing a MgF₂. A raw material of MgF₂ is placed in a chamber. The material is subjected to a scavenger to remove all of the impurities, including metal impurities. The resultant raw material is then melt and cooled. The cooled material is a single crystal of MgF₂. The crystal can be cut and used for excimer laser and other optical devices, note entire reference and specifically examples. The difference between the instant claims and the prior art is the use of a seed and nonmetallically crushing the raw material. However, in the absence of unobvious results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

determine through routine experimentations the optimum, operable seed and crushing in the Obal reference in order to align the crystal a set way as the use of a seed to align is well known in the art and to crush the material in order to increase the surface area to allow for more reduction in impurities.

Claims 1 to 7 and 9 to 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oba (6,238,479).

The Oba reference is relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differs from the instant claim in the cooling rate. However, in the absence of unobvious results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentations the optimum, operable cooling rate in the Oba reference in order to reduce defects in the grown crystals.

Examiner's Remarks

The remaining references are merely cited of interest as showing the state of the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Kunemund whose telephone number is 703-308-1091. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ben Utech can be reached on 703-308-3636. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 1765

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

RMK

POBERT KUNEMUND PRIMARY EXAMINER